



JUL 19 2017

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

KYLE LYDELL CANTY
Plaintiff,

Case NO. 2:16-CV-01655-
RAJ- JPD

VS.

CITY OF SEATTLE et al
Defendants.

MOTION
PURSUANT TO
LCR 26(a),(c),(f)
DUTY TO
DISCLOSE
GENERAL PROVISIONS
GOVERNING DISCOVERY
NOTE ON MOTION
CALENDAR
AUGUST 13, 2017

COMES NOW, the Plaintiff Kyle
Lydell Canty, In Propria Persona
and of Sui Juris on the 10th
day of the month of July year
2017, moves this Court Pursuant

P 1 of 5
LCR 26

to LCR 26(a),(c),(f) Duty to disclose MR. Canty the Plaintiff elects to provide the defendants early discovery, however MR. Canty the Plaintiff still wishes to proceed on to Jury trial as noted on the amended Complaint pursuant to LCR 38, and served upon the defendants via Personal Service by United States Marshal

Affidavit of facts

1. The Plaintiff Kyle Lydell Canty is electing to provide and use the defendants very own discovery that the State of Washington provided to him, in order for the Plaintiff to present a meaningful case the time for his Duty to disclose is now! Pursuant to LCR 26(F) Conference of the parties; Planning for Discovery

2. The defendant City of Seattle

(EXHIBITS G, H, I, J Attached)

has already had the discovery for over one year now, specifically the internal affairs Complaint, handwritten by the plaintiff and submitted and filed by the plaintiff at the City Clerks office, the plaintiff has submitted and filed over one hundred and twenty three pages of discovery ahead of time in which includes the plaintiff's medical records from Harborview medical center, serial numbers to the stolen laptop, receipts, invoices, estimates, claim for damages forms ect ect. Please (see exhibit G) that proves that MR. Canty has left a extensive paper trail with the defendant

3. The defendant City of Seattle and it's officers, along with representatives of the City (Gary Shutes) chose not to resolve the dispute without court action, in fact Gary Shutes in

his own hand typed and Signed letter invited MR. Kyle Lydell Canty the Plaintiff to file legal Civil action, before this letter that MR. Gary Shutes mailed to the Plaintiff, the defendant City of Seattle's representative Gary Shutes and the Plaintiff Kyle Lydell Canty had a Phone Conversation and the defendant City of Seattle still did not want to resolve the dispute without Court action, thus pursuant to LCR 26(C) Protective Orders the Plaintiff/movant has engaged in a good faith Conference/Phone Call in a effort to resolve the dispute without Court action Please See Exhibit of Gary Shutes letter inviting the Plaintiff MR. Canty to file Civil legal action Previously Sent in to the Courts

4. The Plaintiff Kyle Lydell Canty has already provided to the

defendants City of Seattle, along with it's officers, and King County all of this very same discovery a year ago, but MR. Canty will be happy to resubmit it Pursuant to LCR 26(a), and LCR 16(c)(2)

5. The defendants King County along with it's employee's continue to dare the Plaintiff to file Civil legal actions, and King County along with it's employee's have also had the early discovery but MR. Canty will be happy to resubmit it Pursuant to LCR 26(a),(c),(f) and LCR 16(c)(2).

Prepared by:

2/07/10/2017

Kyle Lydell Canty
BA# 216035994
500 Fifth Ave
Seattle WA 98104

P 5 of 5
LCR 26